

# Duke University

DURHAM  
NORTH CAROLINA  
27708-0928

ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL  
102 ALLEN BLDG  
CAMPUS BOX 90029

## Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council

Thursday, April 9, 2015

### Call to Order

**Council Chair Professor Thomas Robisheaux (History):** Colleagues, let me welcome you to the April 9th meeting of the Arts & Sciences Council. This is our first of two meetings in April. We have a lot of business here at the end of the semester and I appreciate your attention to it all. Let me just make a couple of announcements before we move into the first item of business for today. Many of you know, I see some familiar faces from units who are holding Arts & Sciences elections right now. We have ten units whose representatives' term of office expires at the end of this term and those units need to elect new members. That process is underway right now and we will announce the results at the end of the month. There will be at the April 23rd meeting another election. We have one member for the Executive Committee of the Council that is rotating off, Steffen Bass. So the Council will need to elect from among its own membership one of its members from the Natural Sciences to replace Steffen. Then the term of office for your chair, me, comes to an end as well this semester and there's going to be in a week or two a general election among all the Arts & Sciences faculty members for that position. Let me also say thanks to Mary Nettleton and the IT support staff in Arts & Sciences. We have the new electronic voting platform which is automatically updated and connected to databases of faculty members so we have tested it. I have personally tested it and it worked fine for me. I think Dave Trammel is about ready to let it loose among the faculty in the coming weeks.

My second announcement. Do we have any representatives from the Duke Student Government here? I am looking around the room. Anton Saleh?

**Anton Saleh:** I am right here.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Great. Why don't you come up here and then while you're coming up here to make your announcement, I want to make two brief announcements. One is that due to the very full agenda that we have, we will return to the plagiarism report and its recommendations at the April 23rd meeting. There just really wasn't enough space or time on the calendar for today, but we are not going to let that lie. I really want to return to that as soon as we possibly can.

And finally a very brief announcement: the Faculty Research Committee, which as you know is also one of the standing committees in Arts & Sciences, met on Tuesday morning to make awards to faculty who have applied for their support for travel to conferences, for research support, and so on and so forth. Valeria Finucci has done an amazing job of reconstituting the committee, developing clear and transparent practices on the committee, and making awards, and those who have been receiving the awards will receive notice very shortly. Let me also introduce Anton. If you could just come up here a minute. I am going to give you five minutes or so because we have a lot of business. In fact earlier in the year, in response to some concerns by directors of undergraduate studies and faculty members about the last day of classes - LDOC. We met, the Executive Committee had a meeting with student leaders. Lavanya Sunder, who is the outgoing president of DSG. Anton and his. Gregory is co-chair? No, he's head of the union, isn't he?

**Anton Saleh:** He was the former head of the union.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Former head of the union. And you are head of the LDOC committee.

**Anton Saleh:** LDOC committee with David Soled. My co-chair couldn't be here today.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Okay. And Steve Nowicki was there, and Larry Moneta and Lee Baker and all of us on ECASC. And some faculty members were also there. We voiced concerns that will be familiar to you about the disruptions that occur on LDOC. The most serious of which are disruptions right in the classroom from students who are drunk or disorderly, all the way through to disruptions in the general atmosphere on West Campus, particularly bad for some classrooms who find the noise is disruptive. In conversations with the Duke student leaders and Larry, serious solutions were worked out or at least measure to be taken this year and we're hoping we are going to help ratchet down some of the problems. Anton? Let me turn the floor over to you. If you will about five minutes? If you would?

**Anton Saleh:** Let me start off by introducing myself. Good afternoon. My name is Anton Saleh. I am a sophomore here at Duke University. I am here with my advisor, Jessie from Housing. I would like to introduce our next year's LDOC co-chair, Holly McClain, so she will be working with you all next year. So as some of you may remember, last fall we met and we had heard about some of the concerns you guys had about students coming to class drunk. I think that was the big thing we were really concerned about and not taking the day seriously. Our LDOC committee evaluated some of these points and we have some things that we have implemented that we would like to share with you guys today. Last time we met. Well every year LDOC has a theme. When we had met, our theme was "Better Together". We thought it would be kind of a nice way to keep an inclusive environment for the students. After meeting with you guys we actually had changed the theme to "Stay Classy" with the 1-5 being for the graduating class this year. We find it's a great reminder for students to go to class on LDOC. It's these small, more subtle things, but things that we consistently are telling the students in all our Facebook post and all our emails. Stay classy. Don't come to class drunk. Don't be drunk in class. Go to class. I think this was our big push and why we went with this motto after talking with you all about it. We included that through all our email blasts which reaches the entire student body and all our social media posting on Facebook, Twitter, etc., that reaches over 3,000 people every time you post. Whether that is a t-shirt design or poster or anything we are promoting off and online. It always ends with "Stay Classy" so students know that is our theme and that what we are pushing for this year.

This year we have also have been working with DIDO, which is the innovative design group on campus. They design all the posters, all the info-graphics that we will putting up around campus. This year's campaign will be visual as well as digital. You will be seeing a lot of info-graphics coming up around campus, online, and our hope is to continue to promote this message and working with DIDO to create innovative, cool designs for students so they can relate to it. There are seven different posters being made this year, each will be tackling a wellness or academic issue -- and I'll go into discussion on one in particular that we made -- and our goal is to blast this out to the whole school so they can see it and they are aware of it. It is very visual and very engaging. The concept for one of these posters in particular that I wanted to share -- it is being created as we speak -- is the mascot: a penguin in a suit. The poster says, "Go to Class." It will say, "a classy affair." A student in class in graduation attire. Essentially just reminding them, if you want to graduate you are going to stay sober, you are going to be here, you are going to stay classy. is kind of our point. These are just these subtle hints that we are going for through this campaign to remind students it is important. LDOC is still a day of class. That was the message that David and I took from our last meeting with you guys. Furthermore, we have an A-Team meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup>, next Monday, where we will be meeting with administrators who serve on the A-team, as well as student leaders on campus, which will include all selective living groups, graduate students, GPSC and leaders of the graduate student program, all fraternity and sorority life leaders. They will all be attending this meeting, and at this time, my Co-chair, Adam and I are going to reiterate the point that on LDOC going to class is not... It shouldn't be "suggested," it is a priority and needs to be done. This is a very strong message that we have in our PowerPoint and it will be reiterate by all three of us. I think that's a big step in the right direction. We find that after talking to our advisors about this, who work a lot in student activities, we find that peer-to-peer relationship are often the best way to implement this message. David and I are strongly behind it, the LDOC committee is as well and we are going to make sure the students hear our voice and we hope they will reiterate that back to their selective living groups and other committees on campus.

Finally, I know last time we met, you guys asked for a number for support if you had any questions throughout the day, just about anything that had to do with LDOC. We have the UCA office front desk, we'll have somebody working there the entire day and that number is here and I will make sure to get this PowerPoint out to all of you. If you have any questions or concerns about the day of or anything you need to know, that number will be readily available and you will have access to both the advisors and myself on the day of LDOC. So those were the steps we have taken this semester. I can open up for discussion, if anyone has any questions?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Let me add a couple of other things. I don't think we have much time for discussion, Anton, but I know we really appreciate the extra efforts that you have taken this year and I think you are probably dead on about getting students to be responsible for students. I will make sure that this number telephone number goes out to all the faculty of Arts & Sciences in an announcement from the Arts & Sciences Council so that any faculty member who wants to report something has a phone number they can call. I know that the Executive Committee had two other recommendations. This is

for faculty members and you might take this back to your departments. One is don't allow any excused absences on the last day of classes. There is a fabric on that day and the last couple of days of classes and if several faculty members start to let the fabric go, it has spillover effects for other classes, too. I would encourage you to also have academic exercises, use it as an academic day so that students know from your vantage point as faculty members this is not a party day as far as you are concerned. This is really important time in the semester in finishing up class. Lee, did you want to say something about LDOC from your vantage point?

**Lee Baker:** Yeah. Thanks. Over the years, LDOC has become more healthy and just better engaged with the faculty. It has been a good discussion. But some of the trade-offs is that students are engaged in activities during the day, and what is important for faculty to know is that students should realize that they still should be in class, not doing the poetry slam or another activity during the day. If they don't have class, they should definitely engage in that. That has been another sort of challenge. We understand the trade-off: you want to have programming throughout the day so students are doing something as opposed to getting ready for the party or the big concert. We have looked at this carefully, strategically and we appreciate your partnership.

**Anton Saleh:** Right. We will continue to have a partnership in the future and I think we both have found this to be effective for both sides and having an active dialogue has been the best for us, in terms of creating a team that can work with you guys in terms of what we all want to achieve here. So thank you guys for your time. I appreciate it.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Thank you very much, Anton. We'll let you know how it works, too. Sherryl, we really have little time for discussion but do you want to make a very brief comment?

**Sherryl Broverman (Biology):** You can tell me if you want to table this but I just looked at the schedule for LDOC. Has it even been where LDOC starts at four in the afternoon or has it always traditionally been a whole day event? Has that ever been something that has discussed?

**Tom Robisheaux:** We on the Executive Committee have asked Anton's committee to move activities later in the day. But I haven't looked at the schedule to see if that actually happened? But you have activities starting early in the morning?

**Anton Saleh:** I'll let Jesse talk about that.

**Jessie (Housing):** Yeah we have activities starting at nine. The Chapel Climb is the first one which students are required to be sober for a Chapel Climb. So hopefully they will be, but similar to what Lee was saying just a second ago, there is this catch 22 between offering daytime programming activities to keep students from. to encourage students to pace themselves as far as getting prepared for the concert in whatever plan they choose to do that. Also, attending classes. Obviously our encouragement will be to attend classes before attending any of the day time programming activities but for those students who maybe don't have early morning classes, we'd prefer them doing a Chapel Climb rather than binge drinking.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Thank you very much.

**Anton Saleh:** Thank you, guys. I appreciate it.

### **Strategic Planning in A&S: Open Discussion**

**Tom Robisheaux:** Let me turn now to our first item of business. All of you know about the launch of the Provost Strategic Planning Initiative and we have the two co-chairs of the Provost committee here today, Noah Pickus and Susan Lozier. I want to put the focus on the Arts & Sciences faculty members and strategic planning in Arts & Sciences. We also have Alex Hartemink who sits on the committee and is one of our five faculty members from Arts & Sciences on the committee. Alex, why don't you come on up, if you would? The discussion in Arts & Sciences in strategic planning is progressing along two tracks. I would say there is the really primary track which is the administrative track: department chairs on to the deans and so on and the Provost level. Also, we wanted to involve the faculty at large in as much as possible in discussion of our University and how we want it to look in ten years. I particularly want us to focus on what Arts & Sciences should look like in ten years. Let me turn this over to Alex. This is your chance to bend his ear and also perhaps Susan and Noah listen in on priorities that you think Arts & Sciences should have over the next decade.

**Alex Hartemink (Computer Science):** Thanks for the introduction and I won't take too much more of your time since time is limited. I will just emphasize that contrast between trying to figure out what A & S should do as the subtotal of its

department versus what the University should do where A & S is one of the entities being considered. We are focusing today on the latter. So what are the University goals that A & S is most concerned about? These are some questions we have been asking people. These are just to jog your thinking. I want this to be really open-ended. You can say things related to these openly. If not, you can go in another direction. I will try to reign us in if it gets too crazy. Tom will cut us off when our time is done. Really we are here to listen and hear what you have to say about where Duke is going in roughly ten year horizon, in the context of higher education with respect to A&S concerns. I will open the floor to anyone and I will just take notes.

**Richard MacPhail (Chemistry):** One thing I would like to mention is that a lot of us in sciences, in other disciplines, are moving towards flipped classrooms and things and a lot of these are large classes or medium size classes and the facilities here don't really promote that very effectively. They kind of hinder that. I have some colleagues who are trying to do flipped classes in 107 which really doesn't work well. I have the opportunity, since mine is a little smaller, to use a room is more effective but it seems to me that is something that is going to grow in the next ten years and we have to be mindful of that.

**Alex Hartemink:** Classroom space must be more modern and flexible for different modes of education. Great.

**Steffen Bass (Physics):** I would like to broaden this out generally in terms of infrastructure and work space. Yes, there is a lot of spaces here on campus that are not really well aligned with our education and research, for that matter, in the 21st century. We need more conference rooms that are pre-wired for video conferencing or at least facilitate that. It shouldn't be every conference room has a projector or a big screen in there because these days any presentation we give is coming from a computer. We have buildings with long corridors and simple offices and that again is not very conducive to interacting in groups. We need spaces that are designed to be vertically integrated, like what we have now with all these Bass initiatives, of which I can take no credit, despite my name. When we try to do that, then it would be good if we had spaces that actually go hand-in-hand. I totally understand that this is not something that we can revamp the campus in the ten years. But if we don't pay attention to this now and every planning process that gets started then we are never going to get there.

**Alex Hartemink:** Yes, it has to be a priority. Great.

**Lee Baker (Trinity College):** You have heard me say this before, but I think that the cost of higher education up 4% over the next ten years, it is going to be not affordable for anyone without the faculty benefit. Most importantly, being attentive to financial aid and the students in the middle, the upper middle class families that can't write that big check is going to be really important. Second thing is looking at the role of institutes as well as other schools and their participation in undergraduate education and ensuring that is a direction that Arts & Sciences doesn't have to entirely fund. Not just the funding, but the relationship models between institutes, other schools and undergraduate education.

**Alex Hartemink:** So there is the general question on institutes, but the more specific concern is about how that intersects with education and teaching.

**Steffen Bass:** I want to put in another aspect to what Lee has been saying. Our institution right now is fortunate in terms of offering need-blind admission which helps the students. But that is currently sitting on a financial model that is not sustainable. We are running a deficit with that, and that means that it creates tension, it creates pressure and all the other things we want to do in order to support our teaching mission and our faculty research and so forth. So trying to put the need-blind financial aid to a model that is sustainable or come up with a different model that is sustainable is going to be one of the major challenges moving forward. We can't just say this is the principal that we have to subscribe to out of moral grounds and not fund it properly and make it a sustainable long term goal.

**Lee Baker:** I think the need-blind, we want for the next ten years.

**Alex Hartemink:** You weren't questioning our commitment to that, you were questioning how it was sustainable?

**Steffen Bass:** Yes. How we'll be running a deficit.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I am sure this has come up in a lot of conversions and it relates to the big tweak. I think students learn faster and are most engaged when they have really personal faculty relations and then they are involved in projects or something that has a real-world basis. Duke has done this in multiple ways. The Focus Program does it, the Duke Immerse brings things together ... but those are sort of boutique experience that aren't available to many students. If we could somehow figure out a way, there is a money and people issue, of creating more broad, vast connections, and make that a more integrated component, where you know when you come to Duke and you know you will be involved in project-based

learning that grows over a prolonged period of time and you build that deep faculty relationship and mentoring and it has a real work component. I think the literature obviously speaks to that. I'm part of an international program that says all science education particularly should be taught through a humanitarian issue or a civic issue. I have a colleague who teaches statistics through world hunger. You don't know who ate today, we have models for that. That really engages people who weren't engaged in other ways perhaps in certain areas. I think Duke Immerse is a really expensive program, Focus is a really expensive program because of the faculty attention. If there is ways to figure out how to integrate that so it's not sort of one offs you do your freshman year, or you only do one time, I think that would really make Duke a very different place intellectually.

**Susan Lozier (NSOE):** Can I just add something to that? I have heard this many times from students. Basically they say come to Duke and then they still keep having to apply, because they apply to Duke Immerse or DukeEngage, whatever. So what we are hearing is that we want to make that a normative experience. I will say one other thing, that graduate professional students are also asking for this same exposure. In some ways, if I had to characterize our outreach to students and what we are hearing, it's that undergraduates students feel swamped and overwhelmed about all the available programs and trying to navigate it is problematic and they have to apply. Whereas the graduate and professional students feel there is though an absence or a deficit on their end.

**Wahneema Lubiano (Literature):** I have three areas that I will outline quickly. The first is, I am interested in whether the committee is thinking about disciplinarity, especially because I think of it as important in regards to student contact. We are teaching students through our majors and our minors, we are helping them with their acquisition of knowledge, and we do that largely at the level of the department. So there is a way in which departments have to worry about their labor actually being (inaudible) with interdisciplinary programs when so much of our work is disciplinarily bound in a generative way. That's the first one. The second has to do with the question that is under secondary questions to consider. How do we ensure that curricular and co-curricular programming better enables students. blahblahblah. We have been talking about this on and off for awhile, but I wonder if the committee is taking seriously the work of actually limiting co-curricular and extracurricular activity because I see the students increasingly overwhelmed by those possibilities as opposed to having their having their education enhanced by them. The third area is something that's far outside of the university, but the university is tied to it, and that's what's going on in secondary education as we watch states across the country water down their curricula or actually cull important areas of knowledge from their curricula. Does Duke have an interest in somehow having a stake in that conversation apart from the more attenuated one where we teach people who are going to end up in the public classroom or the K-12 classroom.

**Alex Hartemink:** Thank you.

**Tom Robisheaux:** One thing in my mind that connects a number of things that we talk about in curriculum is creating a signature curriculum for Duke hasn't been mentioned yet. And I say this because there's a subtext in Arts & Sciences about faculty members' time. You and I are expecting more and more of our faculty to do more and more and more. There is often very little support for and we're just supposed to carve out a few more hours in the day to add on to fixing all these problems. My suggestion would be to think very hard about whether this isn't the time to create a Center for Learning and Teaching, or Teaching and Learning. I know we have had a history of that. We also have a wonderful Center for Instructional Technology. What's happened to Duke over the last ten years though is that teaching has been coded as technological. There is almost no discussion or support for faculty who are thinking about teaching in a broad way, starting with integrating the experiential with academic learning, enhancing the humanities seminar, oh my gosh, you can just go on and on and on. Whenever teaching comes up, we are often told to go over to CIT. I know there are experts over there who know a lot about teaching who can very candid and can be very helpful to faculty. I think in the minds of most faculty, teaching at Duke is equated with computer-assisted teaching techniques, the flipped classroom gets all the attention. But actually, what percentage of our students don't experience that? 75% percent of our classes are really small. That's where I think we need some kind of systemic support of faculty at all stages of career, to really embrace and learn from these innovations to make our curriculum so interesting that we have students who actually want to come to Duke because of the curriculum. It seems like a revolutionary idea. But I would love to see Duke attract students because we are known for our curriculum in 2025, not just because they are going to get a degree from a prestigious research university.

**Lee Willard (A&S):** So why don't we say this is the sub-point to the Center for Teaching and Learning: a center for learning to accommodate the various ways that students learn in various preparations. I have said before in the Council we have an increasing diverse student body and there is no "normal" student. We are teaching to the edges and this would support students at all edges with learning specialists so we have a level playing field and to support all of our students to succeed.

**Susan Lozier:** We have been hearing a lot of interested voices in the Center for Teaching. I don't know the history of Duke's prior Center for Teaching, so if I could remind you to give that information.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Lee is actually the institutional historian regarding this.

**Lee Willard:** We first had a Center for Teaching and Learning in the college. It was not staffed fully or trained with professionals, but had people serving in the center and it did not have a developmental potential. It had more of a remedial feel to it. It had an unsuccessful beginning; that's why it merged to the Center for Teaching, Learning and Writing. Then, in budgetary constraint times, it became the Writing Program and then the Thompson Writing Program. The Center for Instructional Technology took some of those tasks under its umbrella, which it still does, like how to design interesting questions -- it's not actually all technology -- some of those functions. But we never had the kind of faculty development center that we need and that Laurie has run some of these programs at Emory and we've done a lot with our faculty workshops. But the original Center for Teaching and Learning was never like that. It was not appropriately staffed or effective.

**Owen Astrachan (Computer Science):** Just one small amendment to that. I was on a group when the Center of Teaching and Learning was either going to grow immensely or disappear -- and I guess it disappeared -- with David Ferrio and bunch of other people. We went to visit all these centers for teaching and learning at a lot of other schools that Duke was like. I don't remember who else was on the committee besides me and David. Several others. There was a perceived need that, for maybe financial or other reasons that I was not privy to, that the work that we did that to say, "Oh yeah, we need to grow this" was ... no.

**Lee Willard:** We had the grant from the Duke Endowment and when that money went away, we were not able to pick it all up. We had several donors, and because we didn't have a compelling stories of success it wasn't continued.

**Noah Pickus (Kenan):** Owen, is there a report from that committee? A summary?

**Owen Astrachan:** I'm guessing there must have been. Whether I can put my hands on it is another question.

**Alex Hartemink:** If you have any notes on that could you send forward to us, that would be great. We talked a lot about space, we talked a lot about undergraduates. What about undergraduates vs. graduate students? Or what about directions that the world is headed that Duke is missing out on? Or what about things that you think are really exciting that other universities are exploring as wacky projects that you think are really great bets on the future? Or what about our relationship with Durham and our different campuses? Just trying to make sure we have a rich conversation.

**Owen Astrachan:** I was going to say something about ... well, we talked about learning spaces and we talked about curriculum. Have any discussions been happening about what faculty will look like? For example, what about doing something bold about post-tenure review, to ask a loaded question.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Or to also focus on time and faculty time commitments, changing APC and.

**Owen Astrachan:** What do faculty actually do, what should they do, how do we assure that we stay vibrant?

**Susan Lozier:** We talked about faculty demographics in terms of tenure track and non tenure track.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I'll just throw this out there. It's a conversation I've had on and off with people for the last ten years. Duke Corps, a fifth-year program where they do immersive services and research. A mini Peace Corps, but Duke based. Duke Corps. Whether it is a build up DukeEngage where they go back for a fifth year and do something, whether it's like a Duke Fulbright, something that allows them to do their scholarship either in a domestic or international arena that is Duke supported.

**Susan Lozier:** It could be not just undergrads, perhaps?

**Sherryl Broverman:** Well I think a 5th year post-grad program. Or the gap year is another thing where people talked about putting it. But I saw this as a part fellowship program, post graduation, continuing working with a faculty member in one of these, whether it is international or domestic, scenarios.

**Alex Hartemink:** Related to that, what if more students thought of Duke was a five-year place not as four years. Now, of course, there are costs associated, but what if in exchange for spending a little more time, they go a little deeper and get a master's or something? What if maybe Duke should be a three-year place? Just throwing it out there.

**Karen Shapiro (AAAS):** Just from the meeting I attended on the history of lynching, one of the key concerns emerged is something you just raised, which is Duke's relationship to Durham and interfacing this city and community, would be the one. The other is a very different sort of comment, and really emerges from lots of conversations I have had with African students who see Duke's engagement essentially for undergraduates vis a vis Africa is one of service, and they would like it to be much more about learning how to reintegrate into Africa. So, potentially re-thinking of Duke's relationship particularly with the continent of Africa.

**Tom Robisheaux:** I think we have a couple more minutes if colleagues would like to bring up some other issues right now.

**Laurie Patton (Dean):** We need to house all of these wonderful ideas better. We built a university in 1924 that on the outside looked like a great university and so we became one. The inside of our buildings, particular the ones that house academic mission, have to be, in my view, a number one strategic priority. The buildings that are easy to support, that tend to be donor driven, those are the ones that relate to athletics, those are the ones that relate to student housing. Donors and alums, in particular, are very inspired by that, but we are not at a place where – and this has to be a “Big Duke” conversation. We need it to be coordinated, we need it to be coordinated between schools, we need it to be provostially led so that there's a clear sense that when we are challenged by the buildings that house our academic missions, that that is going to be a priority. I worry about that a lot and the only way we are going to make that happen, I think, is to do that at the “Big D” university level where it becomes a university priority. It is the number one issue on our heat map and it will remain that way for awhile.

**Alex Hartemink:** So to make sure I am understanding you: it is easy to raise money for things like athletic buildings, art buildings, student life, the union, but how do you raise money for academic classroom buildings or office space?

**Laurie Patton:** That's right.

**Lee Baker:** I'll remind you West Duke's roof fell down last year.

**Laurie Patton:** The dean's office had a lot of conversation about how many roofs we could collapse in order to get the renovations that we needed.

**Sherryl Broverman:** One more thing. Huge cost involved, but we don't have a lot of financial aid for international students and so the students that are here tend to be the fairly elite from their countries. That really changes the tenure of the international discussions on campus. Other than the MasterCard Foundation, which was very time- and money-limited and it is going to run out on a few years. We don't bring in students that really represent the middle class of the world. We bring in the elite of the world and I think that would change a lot of who Duke is.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Alex, you have a wonderful shopping list.

**Alex Hartemink:** Yes, many things to think about.

**Tom Robisheaux:** I assume you are still having your lunches or other dinners and that people have signed up for them.

**Alex Hartemink:** Yes, we have been listening to people at all levels across the university since December. As the semester comes to a close, we are going to try to consolidate what we have been hearing into major themes and we will bring those back to you next year to get some comments, and also to flesh out. So at this point, we are just putting together a skeleton and all of next year we will be putting flesh onto that skeleton. So thanks for giving us this time.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Thank you, Alex. Much appreciated.

### **Bylaw Revision Proposals**

**Tom Robisheaux:** I am going to turn the lights out so instead of reading up here necessarily you can turn to the next discussion to something actually on paper. We try to save paper but I think for this discussion it might be easier for some of us to have text before us. The Executive Committee wanted to put this front and center for this meeting for many good reasons. We have been working on modernizing the bylaws of the Arts & Sciences Council for two years. As you can tell from our full agenda today, just one example, it is extremely difficult to bring it right into the center of our discussion because we have some many things to attend to. But now is the time, colleagues. You have had a chance to look at all the different bylaw proposals. There are a number of them, but we have clustered them into three different groups, and I would

like to come back to them and hopefully see if colleagues are ready for a motion or amendment to one or more of these so that we can move on with this project. I thought just to make it, perhaps, but I may be wrong, Dick cautioned me about this.

I thought we would begin with the easiest of the three, which would be the proposal to create a new standing committee of the faculty which would be a Budget Advisory Committee or a budget committee. I thought we would begin there, have our discussion, see if colleagues want a change or disagree with it or don't want to have a budget committee or want to amend it. Then proceed to the second, which I think is a little bit ... we've already discussed at least once, too, and that is the relationship of the Council and its committees to other university offices that have changed so much over the last decade. The final piece involves representation and voting in Council, and if we can begin to get to that today, wonderful; but if not, that is going to be front and center April 23rd for our final meeting. Let me just mention, we have a quorum present. Mary and I have been counting every nose that walked in the door and we have a quorum present. Representatives don't move, okay? No proxy votes are allowed, if there are motions to approve one of these. We would appreciate it if we are ready to vote.

So let me come to the first of the three pieces of bylaw revision proposals. It is at the end of the packet, and you have had a copy of this for a number of weeks. I have mentioned the bylaw revisions and announcements to all the faculty. Everyone knows. I have gotten some emails, but frankly the email that I get is about representation and voting. It's not about a budget committee. It's not about language involving university relations. This budget committee, by the way, has a little history. Just to refresh some of your memories, it was an ad hoc committee created under our previous dean, George McLendon. And then when Laurie Patton became dean, it was continued as an ad hoc committee. Laurie found it helpful, and I want to thank Laurie because she has also been pushing for how supportive and -- what is the other word I'm thinking of -- a budget advisory committee could be. Where you could involve faculty actually in what is going on with the budget and financial incentives within Arts & Sciences. You have the text before you. This is a committee that would have a faculty chair and be appointed in the usual way that faculty committees are, well in one of the ways in which faculty are: the chair of the council would nominate nominees, soliciting suggestions from Executive Committee, faculty at large, whatever, and it would be appointed by the dean of Arts & Sciences. You have the text before you. Any discussion?

**Sherryl Broverman:** This is just to add faculty to create this budget committee?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Yes.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Currently there is no faculty involvement in the discussions of the budget for Arts & Sciences?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Well there is the ad hoc budget committee chaired by Charlie Becker that has Christine Drea..

**Sherryl Broverman:** This is just to make it standing?

**Laurie Patton:** This was something I think is extremely important to solidify because we have had such a good time and it's been so helpful for the last four years. Let's just make this a standing committee. I would feel that the dean, whoever comes after, really will need this committee.

**Tom Robisheaux:** By the way, one of the ways in which it is practiced is not just a budget advisory committee, as you noticed. It also emphasizes communication. Because one of the things that this committee has started to do, and there is a lot more yet to do, is to help faculty be informed about what financial environment in which their research and teaching takes place. Then faculty can be better informed and therefore be in better position to envision the future and make suggestions and so on and so forth.

**Owen Astrachan:** I have a question on how to interpret. Faculty are appointed so that each third of the departments, when ranked according to budget volume over the preceding five years is also be represented. could that be interpreted for us?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Yes. I wish Charlie were here. Charlie Becker. It was Charlie who crafted that language. What it means is that there is a huge spectrum of budgets in our 35 departments and programs. Some are very small, some are very large, some that are at the large end are actually at a very different financial universe from those that are small. What that language does is it says that we need representation on that that committee that doesn't just come from the wealthy departments but it comes from departments at all three tiers. So small departments in terms of revenue and budget are guaranteed representatives with middle sized and large.

**Micaela Janan (Classical Studies):** Am I missing language about the term that each person would serve?



**Tom Robisheaux:** You are missing it, but it would be standard, which would be three years. And by the way, some of this language overlaps with the already standard language in the bylaws for example. revising this Charlie. we just figured that's enough. we have a provision for amending the bylaws, and all of our committee members serve for three years.

**Owen Astrachan:** It says there will be a representative for each of the three divisions. Is it the case that all the -- pick your choice -- Natural Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences, for example, are all in the same third?

**Tom Robisheaux:** I can't answer that question, but Laurie can you?

**Owen Astrachan:** So for example. It occurred to me that all the Natural Sciences might be in the top third. That is possible. In which case that would be, it doesn't matter, but I am asking if anyone has made an analysis to see that this actually can be done with this few representatives?

**Laurie Patton:** I think the idea was that you do the top third in Natural Sciences, top third in Social Sciences, top third in Humanities.

**Sherryl Broverman:** But there are only four faculty that are on it?

**Laurie Patton:** Right, we need to correct that.

**Sherryl Broverman:** Otherwise, you are not getting the bottom half of Natural Sciences.

**Laurie Patton:** Right, I think we just need to change the numbers so it is representative of the bottom and top of each of the divisions.

**Tom Robisheaux:** So then that number should be four.

**Sherryl Broverman:** It says four right now.

**Owen Astrachan:** Nine?

**Tom Robisheaux:** That is too large.

**Linda George (Sociology):** Maybe six, right?

**Cary Moskovitz (TWP):** You have three divisions. Should they all come from the top? You would need one from the middle third and one from the bottom third, whatever those may be.

**Tom Robisheaux:** We can't entertain an amendment if there were a motion to approve this addition to the bylaws.

**Lee Baker:** Or was the rational that -- and this is sort of what Cary was saying -- you can both be Social Sciences and big, and Social Sciences and small.

**Laurie Patton:** This is something that probably got discussed after I was at ECASC. The idea is that, right now, most of our small departments are in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Owen is absolutely right. That's why it is much better to do it by divisions, in my view.

**Tom Robisheaux:** So you would think six members would be appropriate and just sure that there is an equal distribution according to revenue streams.

**Laurie Patton:** Absolutely.

**Tom Robisheaux:** We can't entertain an amendment to this. Not unless there is a motion on the floor to approve this and then we can open it up for discussion for amendments. Right now, parliamentary procedurally speaking, it still belongs to ECASC. But if you were to make a motion to adopt this and it would be seconded, then it becomes yours and you can do with it what you want.

**Owen Astrachan:** I would be happy to make a motion for us to adopt this.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I would be happy to second it.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Okay we had a motion that's been seconded to adopt this proposal to create a new standing faculty committee on the budget. Now the floor is open for discussion and motions to amend.

**Linda George:** With the consent of the person who made this motion, I would like a friendly amendment to change the members of the committee in Part B from four to six.

**Owen Astrachan:** Sounds like a good idea to me.

**Tom Robisheaux:** You accept that as a friendly amendment?

**Owen Astrachan:** Absolutely friendly.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Any discussion?

**Lee Baker:** About the friendly amendment?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Yes, that is what is on the floor right now. And if the friendly amendment is okay, then we can amend that language to six? Discussion of any other?

**Karin Shapiro:** How would the divisions work then? Big, small, little; Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences?

**Tom Robisheaux:** That will probably work itself out, given the experience of staffing committees. It depends on who is available, who will serve, and we will try. I think this relies upon best practices and good efforts of the Dean and the Chair of the Council to be sure you get that distribution. It will vary, probably, a little bit depending upon ..

**Linda George:** And even among the very rich Natural Sciences, there is a distribution. Somebody is at the bottom of that.

**Laurie Patton:** Said the sociologist.

**Linda George:** There is inequality on all fronts.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Any further discussion? Do I hear a motion to approve the addition to the bylaws as amended?

**Dick MacPhail:** So moved.

**Tom Robisheaux:** So moved by Dick MacPhail.

**Steffen Bass:** Seconded.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Mary, we have ballots, don't we? We are going to vote one third at a time.

**Lee Baker:** This is just for the amendment?

**Tom Robisheaux:** No, we've already adopted the friendly amendment. We don't have to vote on that.

**Lee Baker:** So there's more discussion, then?

**Tom Robisheaux:** There's more, but I want to do this chunk first. Then we'll come to the next part about university relations. We are voting on budget committee only now.

**Lee Baker:** So under membership. I don't know if this matters, but it shifts from "Dean of Trinity College of Arts & Sciences" and then "the Dean of Arts & Sciences shall appoint the chair." So are we assuming that is the same person.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Yes. That language should be corrected for the office. That is Dean of Arts & Sciences, is that?

**Laurie Patton:** It's Dean of Trinity College of Arts & Sciences.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Okay, so we will just make that language consistent so it's clear that it's not two different people. Any further discussion? We have a motion on the floor and it has been seconded to approve. Should we do ballots or do you want to show by hand? Ballots. Mary, will you distribute ballots?

**Owen Astrachan:** Do we need two thirds of the members present to approve this?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Yes, to approve an amendment to the bylaws, there has to be a quorum. I've confirmed that, I've been watching that. There's eighteen of us here, eighteen out of thirty five. That is a majority. So we have a quorum. In order for this to be approved, twelve of eighteen need to approve. It's not a simple majority. Only council representatives, or in their place alternates, of a department or program may vote.

While the votes are being gathered and counted, let's move to the second third, which is going to be in the middle of your document bundle. No, it is at the beginning, I'm sorry. It's probably the longest and has the most because it is amending language. Some of it is very technical in the sense that it corrects the title of the office has changed since the bylaws were drawn up. Some of them incorporate relationships that have been cooperative, but now they are being into the bylaws. I will just call your attention to the most important one of them, and that is to establish a relationship with the Arts & Sciences Council and some of the committees in Steve Nowicki's office, that is, the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. What this does, I think, it reflects what has happened to our Council over the last decade, especially, as the University changes. Arts & Sciences Council remains the place to go regarding undergraduate education but now that sprawls across Pratt School of Engineering, which is a separate of entity, of course, and they have their own curriculum that they tend. But we have representatives from the Nicholas School because we have students over there. We have Sanford School, we have representatives from the Sanford School. This updates the bylaws to incorporate in a more formal way working practices that have evolved over the past ten years or so. So let me open the floor for discussion. First off, we need a motion and then we can open it up for discussion.

**Owen Astrachan:** This is revision one?

**Linda George:** Why don't you list the numbers?

**Tom Robisheaux:** I would personally like to do all of them. There are ten revisions, or if Council representatives prefer, we can go through them one by one? That would be alright with me, too. Would you prefer to go one by one?

**Owen Astrachan:** I would like to consider all ten at once.

**Sherryl Broverman:** I second that.

**Tom Robisheaux:** This is a procedural vote so there is not discussion for that. All those in favor? All those who oppose? One? The motion passes. So we are now considering all ten proposed revisions as a bundle. By the way, that does not preclude changing any single part of them. It's just that what we are doing is considering them as one whole.

**Cary Moskovitz:** I'm not a voting member.

**Tom Robisheaux:** That's okay; you can comment.

**Cary Moskovitz:** Two things, one is the Committee on Courses for the last 5-6 years has run with 2 co-chairs rather than a single chair. I suggest that the language be changed to leave it as either/or. I don't know what is going to happen in the future with that but we don't want to start out with bylaws that we are in violation of. The other is just a question. As I understand the amendment for including other units which would include the Thompson Writing Program.

**Tom Robisheaux:** That is the next chunk. That is the third chunk, in representation and voting. This is only formal relationships to the Council. Much of it is simply updating language to reflect offices or titles that actually exist as opposed to fictional ones that disappeared eight years ago or something like that. For example, in revisions one and two, you will find that the Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education office was created in 2008, but that office has had no formal relationship. Steve and Laurie have worked beautifully together, but we all thought it was time to formalize the

relationship with that office to the Council itself, without disrupting the very special and primary relationships between Arts & Sciences faculty and its Council and the Dean of Arts & Sciences.

**Owen Astrachan:** I have a small question about wording. As I read through these revisions, each time it says something like DPVU, it talks about Steve Nowicki, and each time it talks about the illustrious Lee Baker, it says the illustrious Lee Baker. Would it be better to leave it as Dean of Academic Affairs without labeling that person and similarly Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Where it says, “revision number six,” that’s not the language. That’s just the context to explain what happens in number six. If you look at the yellow highlights, that is the specific wording that is being changed.

**Owen Astrachan:** Okay, good. I got it.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Much of it has to do with the Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, that office.

**Wahneema Lubiano (Literature):** I’m sorry, I am confused. I am looking at revision three. The language under that, that says proposed revision. So I am specifically looking at “each department and program will have one member and one alternate except for the three military departments which will have one member and one alternative representing all of them.” Is this the language in which we change the make-up of Arts & Sciences?

**Tom Robisheaux:** No, not at all. Wahneema, if you look, continue that to the top of next page. You see two things that are highlighted in yellow and that is all that is being altered in that. And that is to reflect the offices that currently exist, as opposed to the language that refer to offices that no longer exist. Wherever you see yellow, that is where there is going to the changes.

**Wahneema Lubiano:** So the document that is entitled, “Part Two: Representation...”

**Tom Robisheaux:** That's third, that's separate. We are going to deal with that afterwards.

**Wahneema Lubiano:** Okay.

**Tom Robisheaux:** I was just thinking that colleagues would need to talk more about this part than with the University relations step. There is a lot more in this bundle, but most of it is just language and I think that actually the one that took the most time in discussing and working through was the Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and his and her relationship to the Council committees.

**Linda George:** Which is revision number what?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Revision number 7, revision number 8, revision number 9, revision number 10. Those actually just insert the Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, but clarifies actually who makes the appointments. This took time to get the wording correct. Actually, Steve Nowicki's office, the Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, has a separate hierarchical relationship to the Global Education office and therefore it was thought appropriate that his role would be more direct than it is with the other committees.

**Unidentified member:** I was just going to make a motion to vote before we lose our quorum.

**Tom Robisheaux:** I would love that.

**Linda George:** Moved.

**Owen Astrachan:** Seconded.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Moved and seconded. Discussion is complete. We are ready to vote. Mary, if you would pass these around?

This is amazing. Do you know, colleagues, how much work went into getting this done? I know you’ve had these documents for a number of months now and you’ve had a chance to read them. It’s hard to follow through and come back

to, especially in April. But ECASC and Laurie, as well as Steve Nowicki, have worked on these very, very hard for the last year and a half intensively. We have one other major item of business that I think what I am going to do is to defer the discussion of the third portion of the bylaw revisions which deal with voting representation to the April 23rd meeting. And extort all of you to be here so we have a quorum to vote. Also, if we wish to consider and vote on the plagiarism report and its recommendation.

**Wahneema Lubiano:** So for the discussion on representation and voting, may departments also send a statement to you. I will be here as well.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Yes, absolutely! Yes, or colleagues can come, send statements, read statements, whatever. We realize this is the most ... this is really quite an interesting change. Colleagues will want to think this through. Is this the right step or not?

### **Civic Engagement and Social Change Certificate Proposal**

**Tom Robisheaux:** While the votes are counted, why don't we move to our third item of business and that is to return to the Civic Engagement and Social Change Certificate Proposal. Let me ask Eric Mlyn, I don't think David Malone could make it today or Jan Riggsbee couldn't make it today, but Eric, why don't you come on down here and update us on some of the more recent developments or discussions that you have had regarding the proposal.

**Eric Mlyn (Director, DukeEngage):** I'd be happy to. Thank you, Tom. So I think we had a fruitful conversation in our last meeting here two weeks ago about the Civic Engagement and Social Change certificate with some colleagues asking us to expand some of the departments and colleagues who would be involved in this, and we are pursuing those conversations now. There was also a request that we very clearly identify a director for the experiential certificate and a co-director and kind of an assistant director. So I will be the initial director of the certificate and my colleague David Malone will be the assistant director to begin with. Other than that, I think we have had our chance to present the substance. I don't know if it is appropriate to ask for questions?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Yes, we can have a discussion. Additional questions? Comments? Any further discussion?

**Linda George:** I move that we approve this particular certificate. We had a very good discussion in an earlier meeting. Our questions, such as they were, have been resolved. So I move that we approve this.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Is there is second?

**Ara Wilson (Women's Studies):** No, there is not a second. Eric, I know you reached out to me but there is a short time. So one of the things I raised not just as a department was the question of how diversity was written into the proposal itself. What I am hearing is that you haven't changed the proposal in light of a call to build in questions specifically about diversity, not just generic. That there are debates about civic engagement, but more specifically mention diversity. Has that been built into the proposal?

**Eric Mlyn:** No, it hasn't changed, but as I communicated with you after the meeting, I welcome faculty who bring that perspective to the certificate. We haven't changed the wording of it. I think the current formulation that we have here brings to bear on the question of civic engagement a whole variety of perspectives, from traditional democratic perspectives to neo-colonial perspectives.

**Ara Wilson:** I agree, but as we have learned about formal equality, that does not necessarily achieve diversity. So generally the wisdom from East Campus would be that relying on the potential possibility for incorporating diversity often does not succeed unless, in fact, it's foregrounded and particular attention paid to it. So, we have the potential for racial equality in this country, according to formal law, right? So I had assumed, I mean my assumption was that not only that we would talk to other people sort of ex post facto after it was passed, but that in fact we could revise a textual proposal to more integrated it now at the level of installation. In my experience, not incorporating diversity upfront does not portend well for (ineligible) or then it puts the burden on those folks who you are approaching after the fact to help you modify and change after the fact and figure out how to fit it in and things like that. I would have preferred to see much more attention upfront but then or since the last meeting to writing it into the proposal itself as one of the priorities, one of the main concerns, not just like one course listed, but really sort of recognizing. Another thing more sort of self interested, is that I will wager that minimally a third of these will have to do with gender or sexuality. I will wager that an enormous amount of these projects will have to be gender or sexuality and therefore that certain faculty in departments may be taxed after the fact as well who

have not in fact been part of the designing of the proposal. So, unless you don't plan to have many concerns with women or gender or sexuality issues, not addressing those departments beforehand is not really fair to them, because then it will put pressure on them in a variety of ways to help with a certificate that they haven't been involved in besides. In my experience, a huge amount of civic engagement has to do with those issues.

**Eric Mlyn:** It is possible that this will. So in response to the Curriculum Committee's last request for revision of this last October, we actually greatly circumscribed the kinds of civic projects that could count for this particular experiential certificate, and those would be ones that are not civic engagement but about political and civic engagement. So I don't have a really have a good sense on how many of those would focus on the issues that you are talking about. I think that less than if this were open to civic engagement experiences writ large. Does that make sense?

**Ara Wilson:** Yes. It does make sense but we also don't want to a proliferation of certificates this spring and there are no new programs. So then people who might be interested in that either have to...

**Tom Robisheaux:** Let me just clarify procedural steps at this point. This document does not yet belong to Council, and therefore Council cannot amend it or alter it until there is a motion and seconded on the floor. At which time, the document could be amended and a discussion and voted upon. At this point, what can be recommended is that the drafters of the proposal amend the language, a friendly amendment, before there is a motion formally adopted on the floor. I'm just laying out the possibilities.

**Linda George:** Doesn't my motion still need a second?

**Tom Robisheaux:** That's right. It has not been seconded. This is still Curriculum Committee and David Malone's and Eric's document.

**Wahneema Lubiano:** Is it possible to raise a motion that the proposal itself be amended along the lines of the questions and issues that Ara has raised?

**Tom Robisheaux:** Procedurally, what we need to do is have a motion and then have that seconded, and that means the document belongs to the Council. Then the Council can decide to amend it. What could happen is there could be an amendment proposed, then it would have to be seconded, then debated and discussed and that particular amendment would need to be voted on.

**Ara Wilson:** I feel like how I contextualize what I am talking about is not an amendment because I don't feel ownership of this at all. I don't feel any connection with this at all. It's actually more, a tiny bit more time for the committee to do the work that I think should be done on it, but I think it's speaking to 2015 moments and particularly attention to not the basketball part but some other recent history at Duke University. I would just want to see another draft that reflected these conversations with the departments on board. I don't feel like it my job to do it. I recognize all the work that's gone in here, the academic work part is terrific and all that sort of thing, but I don't think it is my part is to control or amend it.

**Leslie Digby (Evolutionary Anthropology):** I was also on the Curriculum Committee that worked on this, and so I just want to back up Eric a little bit here. That this really originally was a very broad certificate that essentially anyone who went on DukeEngage was doing some kind of civic engagement and they would add this academic component to it. We said we don't want this covering every possible department and any possible project. This is really now narrowed on what does civic engagement do for us as a society. So it wouldn't really be about gender diversity, it would be about this particular approach and theory.

**Ara Wilson:** I don't understand. Seriously, what you are saying is not even legible to me. The idea that you can speak about civic engagement abstractly to a point, I mean, unless you want to call it "white male liberal theory does civic engagement in the 19th century fashion before any kind of critique" or ... I really don't understand what you are saying, literally I don't understand what you are saying. I'm in Women's Studies, I mean, what elements of civic life ... we talk about voting gaps, we talk about what element of civic life is not (inaudible) with race, class, gender, impressions about sometimes sexuality.

**Leslie Digby:** I guess, and Eric, you can help me out here...

**Ara Wilson:** Is voting not a racial issue? You're going to say voting is not a racial issue?

**Leslie Digby:** So it's not about anything involving civic engagement, it is studying the process of civic engagement itself.

**Ara Wilson:** And so that is race neutral?

**Eric Mlyn:** No, absolutely not.

**Leslie Digby:** I also don't think it's going to be a project about this. It's going to be about how...

**Ara Wilson:** Well then I'm not going to support it because I cannot ... I don't even understand what you're ... I mean, I pick up a newspaper and what you're describing is like abstract theoretical physics compared to the daily news or the news on West Campus.

**Eric Mlyn:** I actually don't think this is as far from what you are describing as the current civic political crisis in America. The proposal isn't as far from what you are describing. I think the kind of experiences that would count in the experiential certificate in response to the Curriculum Committee -- they may indeed have to do with race and gender, they may be working with an organization that very much tries to foster political participation amongst African Americans or political participation amongst women. I think that is very much reflected in the theoretical work that is sited in here and it will be part of the gateway course and the capstone course and many of the courses. Now, this is not exhaustive. This is a living certificate, it's going to be a living program that I think, from the beginning, we have broadened it in terms to what is included and are open to broadening it more to include those kinds of issues.

**Ara Wilson:** It isn't about broadening or adding on to, or anything else like that. Females are 50% of the population. The United States... it's like the vision is that there is generic race and general neutral civic life that fundamentally many of us do not see or agree with and we may use abstract political theory to do it. But today I talked Martha Nussbaum. Martha Nussbaum would not agree with a gender neutral approach to civic engagement.

**Eric Mlyn:** No, but I think she would be very comfortable with this certificate and the approach that it has. But I agree with you that she wouldn't agree, but that's not the argument that the intellectual ...

**Ara Wilson:** I don't know because she is critical of liberal theory that does not take into account traditions of exploitation or exclusion.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Colleagues, I am going to exercise the Chair's prerogative to say that this discussion is not complete on this item and that we will come back to this on April 23rd. Eric, I say that because actually this is Laurie Patton's very last time to come to Arts & Sciences Council and I want to respect this small moment we have, the last moment here in Council with our outgoing Dean of Arts & Sciences. So, with all due respect to colleagues who want and need to continue with the discussion and you, Eric. We will pick this up on April 23rd.

### Dean's Corner

**Tom Robisheaux:** I introduce Laurie with sadness but also tremendous pride. I have asked her to come before Council for one last time for Dean's Corner, and we talked a little bit about it and she decided she would be very brief and focus on things that have been going on that are most familiar to us here in the Council. Afterwards, colleagues, please stay. You are exhausted, I know, but you can certainly spare a moment to toast Laurie Patton with a glass of wine at a little reception we have organized for her. So, without any further delay, Laurie Patton, Dean of Arts & Sciences.

**Laurie Patton:** Thanks, Tom. I just want to note that I think that this conversation about civic engagement is really important and I think we need to continue it and I'm really glad we are having it. This is going to be a really quick run through, in a way an assessment of what we have done in the last four years and it's kind of cool, as we think about it. And also, a little bit of where we'd like to go. I should mention that there is going to be an opportunity for me to say good bye to everybody on May 5th at 3 p.m. in Von der Heyden. So there is going to be a lot more chance for people to hang out and spend a little more time. But I very much appreciate this opportunity to talk a little bit about what we have done as a Council together.

I will begin by talking about the kinds of things that I say and have said in the fall address. These themes of Integration, Adaptation, Innovation. You have responded beautifully to them. These are the ways in which we have modified them. And these are the kinds of things that we are focusing on in each of these. I wanted to talk a little bit, in the slides that are

coming up, about how we responded to each of those challenges for the 21st century and, again, our last discussion was an exact example of that.

So what have we done together? The first and most important thing, and you know how I begin with money, is that we have made progress towards a more sustainable budget. A reminder that in 2013, we were looking at a 7.11 million dollar deficit. We have, with your help and leadership, increased revenues, cut expense and our retirements are slightly up. People love to be here, so that is a good problem to have. We are now projecting 1.4 deficit in 2014-2015 this year and 1.1. Note that in both of those years we started with a much larger deficit but we were bringing our own reserves down so that we are slowly making the deficit less, which is exactly where we should be and we ended with a 92k surplus which, as you remember, is tiny but doesn't matter. This is great news, we raised the annual fund from 14.5 to 19 million. From when I started it's almost a third bigger, which is extraordinary for everybody concerned. And we have raised 17 endowed professorships to help with our sustainability around our faculty side, which is really, really wonderful for everybody. Someone in our strategic planning discussion suggested a model where almost all the Arts & Sciences faculty could be on endowed professorships, which would truly be wonderful.

Curricular changes have been just extraordinary. We have the University Course that actually two thirds of that University Course takes place in this room. We have a tremendous faculty response to Signature Courses and we have Bass Connections. These two are, of course, are Arts & Sciences originated. Bass Connections is in collaboration with the Provost office in creating those wonderful learning environments. We also have a, thanks to the leadership of Inge (Walther) as well as many other people, the less commonly taught languages consortium for online teaching for languages that are global for anybody else's perspective but not necessarily from the United States. We are probably going to change that title at some point. With Vanderbilt and UVA it involves a hybrid of face-to-face and online. It has been very vibrant, people are very excited about it. Yale, Columbia and Cornell have the same consortium and many other universities do.

Cultures and languages across the curriculum. Integrating language learning with a number of other topics, not just in our departments, but across the curriculum. And of course what we did two years ago: Global Health co-major, which has more than 90 co-majors now. It took off within a year and now, at 90, is one of our largest co-majors. It is extraordinary. We developed an incubation and certificate in social entrepreneurship, which again is bursting at the seams after only a year. We raised \$5 million for a Language, Arts and Media Program -- Kristin Neuschel, I'm happy to announce, has signed on for the new director for that -- which will integrate speaking as well as online communication as part as what it means for students to learn how to express themselves and communicate effectively in the 21st century. We have the certificate 2.0 model, and in that certificate 2.0 we have both the ISIS certificate and well as ethics as well as entrepreneurship and we just added a new certificate in Decision Sciences. All of these we have done together just in the last four years.

We have done a really wonderful job in improving STEM recruitment and retention. We have raised a grant through Howard Hughes to create a STEM teaching and learning collaborator. We are working on our SAGE advancement through group engagement. We have hired a director of academic engagement to advise and track progress of STEM students, thanks to the leadership of Lee Willard, discipline extraordinary. We have integrated online, but we have not let it rule us. Liberal Arts must drive all of our conversations. We have done a wonderful set of courses that involve online collaboration across research. We have our non-credit MOOCs and we have more classrooms. So we have done a lot of collaborative work and used online to help with the collaborative work. We also have improved advising in a major way, partly through pre-major to major advising. We have increased the number of directors of academic engagement. We are moving to a voluntary four-year advising model as well as a four-year leading model.

Since the Forum for Scholars & Publics started, we have had more than 60 events, 800 mailing list subscribers, 38,000 views on our website, 9,000 views of our YouTube videos. We have 5 different areas in which public scholarship and Trinity college centers are engaged and so much so that Mike Schoenfeld is now starting a whole group of faculty who are engaged in public scholarship.

Our faculty hiring: I heard someone say they had heard there was a hiring freeze in Arts & Sciences in the last four years, and I said, "What?" I hope they come to Arts & Sciences Council more often. We have had a wonderful hiring pattern, even in constrained times, and that includes about 76 hires all together. You see these hires by gender. We've had a great deal of success in the sciences. Those 12 in the humanities are the outstanding hires that we are working on now. The number of faculty age division remains about even, give or take about five. Our hiring by ethnicity. Our African American/black faculty: we have hired 6; Asian, we have hired 7; and we still have a lot of work to do in hiring Latino/Latina. That is going to be one of our challenges moving forward. These are the hires for 2015-16, including, again, about 12 that are still outstanding. Colleen Robles is one of the foremost female mathematicians in the country, she joins Lillian Pierce and Ingrid Daubechies. And we have a number of other very exciting hires that will help with the new master's programs as well as English. Our hires in global Asia -- that was one of our big focuses when I first came on, and I



am delighted to say we have made a great deal of progress there in all of our hires including probably the world foremost China historian, one of the top 4-5, Presentjit Duara, will be joining our History department.

In terms of the larger work that we are doing in Natural Sciences, I think the key thing is IID. Stanford just came up with a very interesting curricular model, where they do Information Plus which is an information -- whatever you major in History, English, Biology, etc. You create a digital element/component to that, which is very exciting for us. We are working on an IID on integrating information with any number of things and that is where we need to go for the 21st century.

In Natural Sciences, we have a new colloquia that we are very excited about, that focuses on featuring a diverse number of folks who participate in the Natural Sciences.

Social Sciences: We just received a \$2 million grant to basically place Duke at the forefront of aging research and particularly aging over the life cycle, population studies. Our former Dean of Social Sciences has achieved this and we really now are the premier center, I would say, in the United States because of this grant.

Humanities: In addition to our Humanities Writ Large, which has been extraordinary, we have now a new Mellon grant that focuses on what Wahneema was talking about earlier: disciplinarity. We have already started those seminars that focus on the ways in which disciplinarity can be rethought post interdisciplinarity, and I think Duke is one of the few places that can really think in a post interdisciplinary way.

One of the things I am proudest of, that is most focused here, is of course our strength in faculty governance. We have strong collaboration with ECASC and the Dean. We have our regular updates, we have been working on our bylaws, and we just voted one committee, and we have a lot more faculty engagement with DKU. And finally, the IDC, where it is quite clear to everybody that faculty own the curriculum. If there was one legacy that I would want to make sure was passed along to the new dean, it would be this tradition of strong faculty governance and making it even stronger.

Where do we go from here? If I were to be pushing for Duke's future, which I will be no matter where I am, this is the thing I would say. First of all, I just had dinner with IDC, they are extraordinary people and they are doing really interesting work. We just got a preview of some of the things they are thinking about proposing. I would say that this is going to be a very exciting year next year. It is up to the new dean to get with the program here. There are lots of very specific proposals that are now on the table that are just being floated. A reminder that the IDC community is deeply committed to being iterative, so whatever happens it is not going to be "a committee behind closed doors, here's a proposal, everyone discuss and vote." I have never seen that work in academia and it never will. But rather, "here is what we are thinking of what do you all think?" That's the way the conversation is going to go. So I am really pleased about this.

We are going to be moving forward, unbelievably, with a new science education building that is in partnership with Pratt. It focuses on table top physics which is what we have been needing for about 30 years, a new building in that arena. We are going to have to continue to borrow and fundraise to move forward with that, but it is very exciting that we now have the go ahead to borrow and fundraise and also to begin the actual building of the building.

Second, unexpectedly for all of us, we have suddenly been gifted a new arts center building, which is really quite exciting for everybody. It's going to be on Anderson Street and Campus Drive. It's going to be particularly focused on the Arts, which have been growing and strengthening in a number of different ways over the course of the last 5-6 years. There are already plans moving forward. Rick Powell, our Dean of Humanities, has been very involved in those conversations. We are thinking about housing the new Dance MFA in that building. We are very excited about it.

My questions for us now: I think we can do better on teaching and learning. Here, I do agree with what Tom has said, what Wahneema has said, in other meetings. I think we miss an opportunity to create a better sense of a collective through rigorous conversation about pedagogy. A Center for Teaching and Learning that focuses on that would be extraordinary for all of us. I certainly hope that you can take up the next phase of that conversation and really push for that. There are a lot of other things to think about in terms of how we evaluate teaching and what ways departmental practices can change around conversations around teaching as well as the evaluation of teaching.

One of the things I worry about, I would love to have you take on as next steps: I think we are way more solid than we say we are. I think it would be really important to pay attention to, as we claim this interdisciplinarity, what ways we are forgetting both the positive elements of disciplinarity. The Mellon grant will help with that. But also, where we exist in silos and we don't even realize that we do or we don't do a very good job of overcoming that. I think that would be a very important conversation to have. Also, thinking about where the silos are already that are storing good intellectual grain. How do we think about keeping those silos in a way that allows them to be understood, not just as silos, but as actually as

places that feed the university? Redefining what a silo is, I think, would be really interesting in a post interdisciplinary moment.

The way I would therefore, come back to my three themes -- integration, adaptation, innovation -- I would say the following things: The first, I've been thrilled at the response to the "what's your question" conversations. We have a student that is actually creating "what's your Duke drive" that is student led. That means that our students are, throughout all of their residence halls, thinking about the purpose of their education. That is huge. I think that we are well on our way, particularly through IDC and many other arenas, towards thinking about Duke as an inquiry-driven place with a particular signature around vertical integration. Bass Connections is something that we can integrate into all the departments as a model not just on the themes, but simply as an educational model. I think a lot of people are very excited about that, and it is around "what's your question" in a much bigger way than the smaller exercises that we have been doing at Duke.

Adaption: The two ways that we have adapted over the last four years has been partly an entrepreneurial style. What I mean by that is not that everyone has to become an entrepreneur, but rather the thing that is amazing about this collective body is that people have not been afraid to try things and see if it works. We have done that in curricular change. It's why we are so high metabolism around curricular change. It's because we do have that style. We can call it enterprising style if we don't like the connotations of entrepreneurial.

Financial sustainability, that adaptation that people have really responded to well has been extraordinary. Somebody said to me the other day from outside of Duke, "I am surprised, given all the financial pressures that you experienced, how well and excited your faculty are and how aware they are of the financial constraints." I hope very much that higher education moves out of this phase, and in so doing, creates another understanding what financial sustainability has been. Duke has been extraordinary on this, collaborative with us. Listening to us and willing to educate themselves.

Finally innovation: I think we have done a lot with information, but we have used our knowledge about information to think about what we do best and that is, in my view, curricular innovation, where we marry our research and our research interest with curricular change. If there is one signature for Duke and the Duke curriculum, and Duke faculty that I have experienced more than anything else, if there's one thing, as Tom was saying earlier that people would come to Duke to do, it would be because they know that research is married with curricular innovation in every step of a Duke education. That is what is extraordinary about this place.

I am sure we don't have time for "what's your question." You can ask me either on May 5th or at our small reception. but my response, as you should probably know, is what is the nature of intellectual community? Or how many hundreds of Dukies will I miss. I will miss you all extraordinarily and I can't even begin to tell you how hard it is to leave. You always have one job in your life that completely changes you, this was it for me. Thank you for everything you have done it has been amazing.

**Tom Robisheaux:** Laurie, before you step away and before everyone moves to the bar, I just want to thank you for supporting us. You work hard on behalf of the faculty of Arts & Sciences. We have tested you, we have tried your patience and I have never seen you lose it. I would say we are one of the very few universities who boasts a dean who is not just a first flight scholar but who is a Sanskritist, a poet, and I would also say creative and compassionate. We have been extraordinarily fortunate to have you here. You have changed us. Please accept this small gift on behalf of myself, as Council Chair, and members of the Executive Committee and the Council.